



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS.

The Owl Sacred Pack of the Fox Indians, by TRUMAN MICHELSON. (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 72). Washington, Government Printing Office, 1921.

The ethnological value of the text here presented by MICHELSON is evident: it gives the users' view of a Fox sacred bundle,—the story of its origin, a detailed statement of the ceremonies connected with it, and the text of the songs.

Linguistically this publication is not only the most accurate Algonquian text at our disposal, but is a model of text-presentation in general. What this means everyone will know who has worked outside of a few better-known Indo-European languages. There are many books about language, but very little of human speech is known to science. In the field of Algonquian, for instance, the books, with a few exceptions, such as the work of William Jones and this of MICHELSON, contain little beyond an array of inaccurate paradigms constructed on the Latin model and some pseudo-philosophizing on whatever grammatical categories happen to be foreign to the author's native speech. The phonetics are usually bad; of connected discourse or of word-formation nothing is told. Even Jones, who was part Fox and must have had good knowledge of the tongue, was unable, for want of linguistic training, to make an adequate description. Not only did he confuse his paradigms, but he arrived at no clear statement of such features as the "obviative" (the peculiar subsidiary third person of Algonquian grammar), and what little he gave of word-formation was full of errors. He was able, however, thanks to his native flair, to collect texts more accurate, more copious, and, above all, more intimate, than any before. It was his work¹ that really opened the field of Algonquian to science. Most inappropriately, Jones, invaluable for Algonquian, was sent to the Philippines, where he met his death. It is for-

¹ *Algonquian (Fox)*, by William Jones, revised by Truman Michelson, in *Handbook of American Indian Languages*, by Franz Boas, Part I (Bulletin 40 of the Bureau of American Ethnology), Washington, 1911.

Fox Texts, by William Jones (Publications of the American Ethnological Society, volume 1), Leyden (Brill), 1907.

Ojibwa Texts, collected by William Jones, edited by Truman Michelson (same series, vol. 7), part 1, Leyden (Brill) 1917; part 2, New York (Stechert), 1919.

Kickapoo Tales, collected by William Jones, translated by Truman Michelson (same series, vol. 9), Leyden (Brill), 1915.

tunate that MICHELSON, a scholar of the best Indo-European training, is carrying on the work.

One can imagine few more fascinating experiences in the study of mankind than to hear an Algonquian language spoken and to appreciate upon closer study the marvellous complexity of what one has heard. The scientific problem is correspondingly difficult. I believe that the solution, short of giving linguistic training to a native speaker, lies in the way of *sich einleben*—the notation of everyday speech and the attempt to become, to whatever extent is possible, a member of the speech-community. In the case of the Fox the external difficulties also are enormous; this people, treated with cruelty such as few have met, will scarcely admit one of the "Knife-People" to great familiarity; for the rest, trachoma is endemic, involving a price which MICHELSON has paid,—fortunately without permanent harm. As Fox is the most archaic of the Algonquian languages, its study cannot be replaced by that of the others.

The complexity of Fox appears in the circumstance that even MICHELSON finds in this text inflections hitherto unknown to him, and one or two features that he cannot understand; and indeed, one may know a good deal of an Algonquian language (as such things go) and yet hear a five-year-old child use an inflection or a stem that one has not heard before.

If one may judge from a comparison with the texts published by Jones, from the internal evidence furnished by grammatical analysis, and from comparison with the closely related Menomini, the present text is admirably reproduced. It will be invaluable for the future of Algonquian research — if, indeed, linguistic studies are to have any future. It is safe to presume that MICHELSON's phonetics are impeccable. One could wish that some of the phonetic finesses had been dealt with by a once-for-all statement rather than by diacritical marks and superposed letters, so as not to clutter up the page (as some Greek said), and to keep it from being what Schopenhauer used to call *Augenpulver*. Thus, the inverted apostrophe is used instead of the letter *h*; the *h*-glide which precedes every sibilant is written every time; superposed *k*'s and *d*'s are used to indicate the acoustic effect of unvoiced solution-lenes; the lengthened sound of nasals in final syllables is marked by superposed letters; the peculiar twist of the diphthongal succession *ay* is uniformly rendered by writing *aiy*. A clearer page will help the reader more than such constant reminders of phonetic details which are uniform throughout the language; the more so, as no transcription, however painstaking, can reproduce the acoustic effect of a language one has not heard. In the case of the open and closed sounds of *a*, tradition is in favor of using two symbols, although the present text shows that the variation is

automatic. In one matter the meticulousness of the transcription is especially inconvenient; as the *h*-off-glide of final vowels is uniformly indicated, one cannot distinguish it, except by laborious comparison, from a significant *h* which has become final through loss of vowel in sandhi: thus a word ending in *-a* is often indistinguishable from a word ending in *-ahi* (with *i* lost in sandhi). The investigator, having learned which features are significant, should give the reader the benefit of his knowledge; this I take to be the real value of phonetic transcription. The separation of words should be more fully carried out; especially successive particles are run together in a troublesome way. As word-division is not a phonetic matter, the reader will be helped if one writes, e. g. *kegimesi meg ōn* rather than *kegimesimegōn* (14, 22).² MICHELSON'S is the first Fox text to be given with accentuation. It appears that while word-accent is not significant, the sentence-accent is complex and interesting. The difficult printing is practically faultless; I have noticed only 28, 36, end of line: read hyphen instead of period.

The translation is careful and close. I venture, with due respect to the difficulties of Fox, to suggest:

14, 20: *āhwāpihatamāhetiwātei they begin to cause each other to smoke* (i. e. *to give each other a smoke*), rather than *they begin to be given a smoke together*; to cause people to do something together is rather *-eti-* plus instrumental *-h-*: *ānānu-wasutihānitci they caused them to race with each other*, Jones 208, 5.

16, 40: The text seems to say *By no means* (*āgwi gäh māmāhkātei*) *the women who belong to the gens*, (but rather) *the invited women are the ones who join in the singing*; the translation given by MICHELSON makes more plausible sense, but does not account for the negative in the text.

26, 3: *nīyōnanākwiwīneyā* sounds like *head* or *horns* rather than *ears*, but Algonquian songs are desperate.

28, 33: *Not earlier or later* (*nōta*), *but by all means in the evening* (as opposed to night), *that is when the burial is to be completed*. Construction and verb-form do not admit of connecting the negative with the verb.

50, 39: *Verily, if their bodies get well, do not try to trouble them*. The verb-form has animate object, hence cannot refer to the inanimate *uwīyawāwi*, which, moreover, is preempted as subject of *icigenig*. Correspondingly emend the note, p. 69.

52, 40: *that there might thus be benefiting, that we might thus please the people*. For it is probable that the novel inflection *-inamegi* is the impersonal passive of a transitive verb with animate object.

² For typographical reasons I quote in simplified transcription and without accent-marks.

In view of the inadequacy of Jones' *Sketch*, one wishes that the linguistic notes on pp. 68 ff. were more extensive. Especially some syntactic comments would be helpful. The present text, being a direct statement, throws light on some points that are obscured in the narrative of Jones' *Texts*, with its persistent use of the aorist. The Fox use of independent and conjunct verbs, it appears, is much like that of Ojibwa and Menomini.

To the note on § 12 one may add the example in Jones' *Texts* 348, 1 (same verb as here). It is generally true that in Central Algonquian there are two types of derivatives from nouns and verbs ending in *-wa* and *-wi*: an older stratum, in which the *w* is not included, and a newer, in which the derivation is made from the full stem in *-w*. The short stem before instrumental *-m-* appears also in täpesimäwa *he is happy with him*, cited by MICHELSON, *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 1, 6.

On § 28: For treatment of the stem before *-tuge*, cf. nemat-cinägötuge *he probably holds me in slight esteem*, *Texts* 60, 4; mehkamütuge *he probably found it*, ib. 122, 7.

§ 34: *-tisō-*, as reflexive stem from transitive verb with double object, occurs in Jones' *Texts*: panāpatamātisōwa *he ceases to see it for himself*, 382, 7; pitigatātisōwa *he carries it in for himself*, 250, 23, illustrating both types of double-object inflection. *-tisō-* reflexive from other stems at 284, 2. 286, 22.

§ 41(b): *-asō-*, reflexive-passive, occurs in Jones' *Texts* 220, 8. 12. 380, 8.

§ 41(c): *-āgusi-* (animate), *-āgwat-* (inanimate), reflexive-passive, in Jones' *Texts* 138, 20. 156, 22. 18. 204, 20. 340, 20. 380, 3; also nōtāgusiwa *he is heard*, *Sketch*, 744.

Page 71: I question whether the *w* of *-wetci* is an instrumental, and believe Jones' instrumental *-w-* to be altogether an error, except for a few irregular verbs, where it is rather part of the stem.

The list of sound-variations on page 72 is invaluable, the more so, as much of it applies also to other Central Algonquian; it is entirely the product of MICHELSON's researches. On the same page is given a table of the instrumental suffixes. The transitive verb in Algonquian is inflected not only for the actor, but also for the object; before the inflectional endings there is an element, called the instrumental, which indicates the nature of the action (by tool, by hand, by mouth, by heat, by cutting edge, etc.). In most cases the instrumental differs according to the gender, animate or inanimate, of the object; accordingly, the author here arranges them in two parallel columns. The first pair, however, is a mistake: where the verb with animate object has instrumental *-h-*, that with inanimate object has *-htō-* (not *-h-* as here given). These stems are a living (freely

formed) derivation in Menomini with transitive-causative meaning, and the examples in the published texts suggest that the same is true in Fox; they are:³

animate object	inanimate object
ketemāgihāwa	ketemāgihtōwa <i>makes pitiful</i> , 56, 21. 204, 18.
tanwāwāgihāwa	anwāwāgihtōwa <i>makes resound</i> , 26, 18. 118, 1.
sōgihāwa	sōgihtōwa <i>binds</i> , 140, 7. 146, 1.
kaskihāwa	kaskihtōwa <i>controls</i> , 166, 21. 180, 11.
wanihāwa	wanihtōwa <i>loses</i> , 182, 11. MICHELSON.

American Anthropologist, n. s., 15, 473.

acihāwa	acihtōwa <i>makes</i> , 32, 1. 254, 15.
kicihāwa	kicihtōwa <i>finishes</i> , 24, 26. 254, 15.
mōcihāwa	mōcihtōwa <i>dreams of</i> , 24, 7. <i>Owl Pack</i> , 34, 34.
panātecihāwa	panātecihtōwa <i>ruins</i> , 116, 18. 274, 21.
apwihāwa	apwihtōwa <i>awaits</i> , 212, 18. 214, 21. 262, 1.

For the instrumental for action with a tool, which has -hw- for animate objects, MICHELSON leaves the inanimate-object form undetermined; it has the form -h-. It is freely made in Menomini, and here, too, the examples accessible to me indicate that the same is true in Fox:

teāgahwāwa	teāgahamwa <i>finishes up</i> , 116, 15. 314, 8.
siāgahwāwa	siāgahamwa <i>pours</i> , 258, 19. 264, 10.
sahkahwāwa	sahkahamwa <i>burns</i> , 30, 2. 66, 11.
patahkahwāwa	patahkahamwa <i>pierces</i> , 104, 2. 176, 15.
kehkahwāwa	kehkahamwa <i>points out</i> , 18, 12. 20, 7.
kaskahwāwa	kaskahamwa <i>controls</i> , 46, 10. 176, 8.
kāskāskahwāwa	kāskāskahamwa <i>scrapes</i> , 178, 19. 21.
panahwāwa	panahamwa <i>misses</i> , <i>Sketch</i> 742. 807.
pīnahwāwa	pīnahamwa <i>puts in</i> , 96, 13. 116, 23.
āpinahwāwa	āpinahamwa <i>unties</i> , 78, 4. 290, 22.
pagisahwāwa	pagisahamwa <i>hurls</i> , 12, 20. 372, 7.
anwāwāhwāwa	kukwätwāwāhamwa <i>makes resound</i> , 270, 8. 348, 23. (kukwät- <i>try</i>).
pasigumāhwāwa	kinigumāhamwa <i>acts on nose</i> , 104, 1. <i>Sketch</i> , 768. (pasi- <i>graze</i> , kīni- <i>sharpen</i>).
natināhwāwa	natināhamwa <i>seeks</i> , 58, 11. 278, 5. (instrumental conventionalized).
āpihwāwa	āpihamwa <i>unties</i> , 28, 2. 172, 17.
nasāhkuhwāwa	nasāhkuhamwa <i>roasts on spit</i> , 92, 5. 174, 16.

In the case of the instrumental -t- (-ht-) with inanimate object distinction should be made between the two types of inflection -t- (-ht-) and -tō- (-htō-); the matter is complex, but

³ For simplicity's sake I give always the third person singular independent; numbers are page and line of Jones' Texts.

there seems to be some agreement between the different languages.

Some mention should have been made of irregular verbs, which Jones did not take up in his *Sketch*. For one of them the form with animate object is now quotable: *āwāwa he uses him*, present text, 14, 16; the form with inanimate object *ayōwa he uses it*, Jones, *Texts* 30, 15; all the occurrences in Jones, *Texts*, are reduplicated; the simple form is used in Menomini: *āw* or *uab he uses it*; would be Fox **ōwa*. The form with -t-instrumental mentioned in the list of stems does not seem to occur in the the published Fox material; in Menomini this is a different verb: *ōnāw he affects him by using, uses on him*, *ōtam* same, with inanimate object; this is a normal meaning for the instrumental -n-: -t-.

The book is completed by a very useful list of the stems that occur in the text. It is to be hoped that MICHELSON will use his qualifications, so rare in a field of this kind, to give us a grammar, as complete as may be, of this beautiful but self-willed language of the Sauks and Foxes.

LEONARD BLOOMFIELD.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

The Phonology of the Bakhtiari, Badakhshani, and Madaglashti Dialects of Modern Persian, with Vocabularies. By Major D. L. R. LORIMER. (Prize Publication Fund, Vol. VI of the Royal Asiatic Society.) London, 1922. Pages xi + 205.

This prize publication volume gives a very useful study of two widely separated sets of Modern Iranian dialects, namely, the Bakhtiari in Southwestern Persia and the Badakhshani in Northeastern Afghanistan with the Madaglashti of the Chitral district. These dialects therefore represent respectively certain linguistic phases of eastern and western Iran.

Major LORIMER writes of his subject at first hand, and is evidently a careful recorder, though he modestly says of his contribution that 'it would be futile for an amateur to attempt to beguile the professional philologist,' and he leaves to the latter to judge of the merits and demerits of the work. Since he wrote at different times and sometimes out of reach of books, he adds a Postscript, on pp. 19-20, calling attention to some equations that might be made between his own transcription (his 'long signs really represent quality, and not length') and the symbols employed in the International Phonetic Association. On his desk he nevertheless had a goodly number of Iranian philological works, including *Bartholomae's Altiranisches*